

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 5, 2005 and the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated January 24, 2006. Claims 56, 59-62, 65-68, 70, and 72-82 are pending, with Claims 56, 62, 68, and 70 in independent form. Claims 1-55 have been cancelled by the amendment dated February 22, 2005, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter presented therein. Claims 57, 58, 63, 64, 69, and 71 have been cancelled by this amendment, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter presented therein. Claims 76-82 have been added by this amendment to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Claims 56, 59, 62, 65, 68, and 70 have been amended. In particular, Claims 56 and 62 have been amended to specify that the media and/or finishing attributes operator interface is operatively coupled to a selected group of the plurality of pages. These claims also been amended to specify that such operator interface is configured to facilitate at least one of viewing of, adding to, deleting from, and modifying of the media and/or finishing attributes. Further, these claims have been amended to specify that the operator interface is displayed in response to selections of page representations for the selected group of the plurality of pages. Claims 59 and 65 have been amended in accordance with the changes of their independent Claims 56 and 62, respectively. Claims 68 and 70 have been amended similarly to that described above with respect to Claims 56 to 62, except that the operator interface is displayed in response to a selection of a selected page representation. The other amendments to the claims are believed to be formal in nature, and, consequently, that the scope of the claims have not been narrowed by these other amendments. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action includes a rejection of Claims 56, 59, 62, 65, 68, 69, 70, and 71 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,621,590 (Livingston) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,262,732 (Coleman et al.). Claims 57, 58, 60, 61, 63, 64, 66, and 67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Livingston in view of Coleman et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,694,610 (Habib et al.). Claims 72-75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Livingston in view of Coleman et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,600,412 (Connors). Cancellation of Claims 57, 58, 63, 64, 69, and 71 renders their rejections mute. Applicants respectfully traverse

these rejections and submit that amended independent Claims 56, 62, 68, and 70, as well as their dependent claims, are patentable over the cited references taken separately or in any proper combination for at least the following reasons.

Independent Claim 56 requires a graphic user interface (GUI) for a printer console for controlling the printing of a document having a plurality of pages. Each of the plurality of pages has associated therewith a plurality of media and/or finishing attributes. The graphic user interface includes a page representation for each of the plurality of pages and a media and/or finishing attributes operator interface. The page representations are miniature representations of particular pages as they will look when they are printed. The GUI displays more than one page representation simultaneously. The media and/or finishing attributes operator interface is operatively coupled to a selected group of the plurality of pages and is configured to facilitate at least one of viewing of, adding to, deleting from, and modifying of the media and/or finishing attributes of the selected group of the plurality of pages. The media and/or finishing attributes operator interface is displayed in response to selections of the page representations for the selected group of the plurality of pages.

A notable feature of Claim 56 is the operator interface, operatively coupled to a selected group of the plurality of pages and configured to facilitate at least one viewing of, adding to, deleting from, and modifying of the media and/or finishing attributes of the selected group of the plurality of pages. This operator interface is displayed in response to selections of the page representations for the selective group of the plurality of pages. Accordingly, the present invention as recited in Claim 56, allows an operator to view and/or modify attributes of pages by selecting the page representations of such pages.

Support for the feature can be found in the specification at least at page 22, lines 17-28. This portion of the specification states that “[w]hen the operator wishes to view the page features which have been applied to a particular page (or group of pages) of the document, he/she selects the desired page (or group of pages) using an input device as described above to select the corresponding thumbnail image 304A-D . . . . Once selected, a menu 308, can be viewed which lists descriptors 310 of the various available page features 310 along with an indicator for each feature 310 which indicates whether or not the particular page feature 310 applies to the selected page(s).” Page 23, lines 5-20 of the specification further describe how page features may be set or unset for a selected page.

The inventors determined that it was simpler from a user's perspective to select pages of a document first and then, subsequently, assign attributes to those pages. Because an operator commonly cannot remember what content is on each page of a document, it is useful for the operator to see miniature representations of each page as they will look when they are printed, and be able to select such representations to modify the attributes associated with the particular pages of a document.

In contrast to Claim 56, the Livingston patent is not understood to teach or suggest displaying an attributes operator interface according to Claim 56 in response to a selection of a page representation. The Office Action refers to reference numerals 64 and 58 of FIG. 3A of the Livingston patent, as well as column 5, lines 29-50 of said patent, to allegedly teach an operator interface according to Claim 56. See the first full paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action. However, even if reference numerals 64 and 58 of the Livingston patent are deemed to teach or suggest an operator interface according to Claim 56, which Applicants do not concede, Applicants respectfully submit that such interface (reference numerals 64 and 58) is not displayed in response to selections of page representations. To elaborate, Applicants understand the interface (reference numerals 64 and 58) to be fixed, *i.e.*, always displayed. See column 4, line 65 to column 5, line 17. Upon selection of a feature from the list 64, controls for that feature are displayed in a second portion 58. See column 5, lines 7-9. After selecting a feature, Applicants understand the Livingston patent to teach that a user can then select which page(s) to apply the feature to. See column 5, lines 10-17. See also column 6, lines 60-63. Stated differently, Applicants understand the Livingston patent to teach selecting a feature first from a feature list 64 and then selecting particular pages to which such features should be applied using button 86. Accordingly, Applicants do not understand the Livingston patent to teach that the feature list 64 and the sub-portion 58 are displayed *in response* to selection of a page representation, as required by Claim 56. Further, even if reference numeral 68 of the Livingston patent is deemed a page representation according to Claim 56, which Applicants do not concede, Applicants have found no teaching or suggestion in the Livingston patent that selection of the page representation 68 causes display of the feature list 64 and the sub-portion 58.

The above-described distinction is important because the interface described by the Livingston patent requires that an operator remember the appearance

and content of each of the pages of the operator's document. The operator must select a feature first, and then determine which of the pages to apply such feature to, without being able to see a plurality of visual representations simultaneously. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the process according to the Livingston patent is less user-friendly than that provided by the present invention and recited in Claim 56.

For at least the above-discussed reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 56 is patentable over the Livingston patent. The Office Action refers to the Coleman et al. patent to allegedly teach a plurality of miniature representations of particular pages as they will look when they are printed, such that more than one page representation is displayed simultaneously. See the top of page 3 of the Office Action. Even if this characterization of the Coleman et al. patent is correct, which Applicants do not concede, Applicants do not understand the Coleman et al. patent to teach or suggest displaying a media and/or finishing attributes operator interface in response to selections of page representations, as required by Claim 56 and discussed above. Further, none of the other rejecting references cited in the Office Action are believed to teach or suggest this feature. Accordingly, Claim 56 is believed to be patentable over these references taken separately or in any proper combination. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 56 is therefore respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 62 requires a feature similar to that described above in connection with Claim 56 and is believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Claim 68, worded differently, requires that all of the media and/or finishing attributes associated with a selected page is displayed in response to a selection of the page representation for the selected page. Claim 70, similar to Claim 68, requires displaying all of the media and/or finishing attributes in response to a selection of a selected page representation of the page representations. In regard to the Livingston patent, if preview image 68 is deemed a page representation, Applicants respectfully submit that the Livingston patent does not teach or suggest the selection of the preview image 68 prompting the display of all of the media and/or finishing attributes of such page. Further, Applicants have not found any teaching or suggestion in the Livingston patent regarding selecting the preview image 68. To elaborate, Applicants understand that selection of the scroll bar 70 allows the user to select a specific page in the document, but does not understand the Livingston patent to teach or suggest selection of the preview image 68. See column 5, lines 27-37. None of the other

cited references are believed to teach or suggest at least these features recited in Claims 68 and 70. For at least these reasons, independent Claims 68 and 70 are respectfully submitted to be patentable and withdrawal of their rejections is respectfully requested.


The remaining claims depend from one of the independent claims discussed above, and are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each of these claims, however, is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the forgoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and the allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

JDP:dn  
Attachment(s)  
Telephone No. (585) 726-7522  
Facsimile No. (585) 477-4646

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Justin D. Petruzzelli  
Registration No. 52,118